

Remarks

Claims 1 – 16 are currently pending.

Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Office Action stated that the phrase “inductive image generation” is vague, lacks specificity and fails to describe the invention. This claims have been amended to remove this phrase from claims 1, 2, 9 and 14. The rejection is now considered moot.

Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1 – 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by DeAguiar, et al, U.S. Patent Re. 36, 145 (U.S. Patent 5,263,136).

Claims 1 – 16 are directed to a method or system for interactively viewing and editing a digital image on a computer system that includes among other limitations, maintaining in the computer system a state list having a sequence of image-editing operations to be applied to the archival digital image in order to generate a current edited rendition of the digital image; maintaining in the computer system a set of viewing data including the resolution, offset and extent at which to view the current edited rendition of the digital image; maintaining in the computer system a cache of image tiles comprising portions of views of edited renditions of the archival digital image; and updating and assembling in the image tile cache in response to image-viewing and image-editing instructions, a set of image tiles that generate the current view of the current edited renditions of the archival digital image.

The DeAguiar et al., patent discloses a system for managing tiled images using multiple resolutions. DeAguiar et al. fails to disclose any system for maintaining a state list of image-editing operations applicable to the archived digital image, maintaining a set of viewing data including the resolution, offset and extent, or even maintaining tiles of the edited archival image. DeAguiar et al. is not concerned with image editing, only with the management of tiled images. The only “editing” function performed by DeAguiar et al. is the ability to undo editing operations. This may imply that DeAguiar may be used with an application module that performs image editing functions, but does not provide any details for doing so. Particularly, the use of a state list of image-editing

operations that when performed upon the archival digital image will be reflected in the viewed image. In column 6, lines 50 – 56, DeAguiar admits that the disclosed system does not include image-editing functions but that it could be used with systems that do so. There is no suggestion of using a state list of image-editing functions as set forth in the claimed limitations.

The law is well settled that in order for a reference to anticipate under 35 USC 102, every element must be disclosed with sufficient clarity to enable one skilled in the art to be enabled. This is not the case here. DeAguiar et al. fails to adequately disclose the claimed invention. Since DeAguiar et al. fails to disclose each element of the claims 1 and 9, these claims should be allowable. Claims 2 – 8 depend from claim 1 and claims 10 – 16 depend from claim 9 and thus these claims should be allowable as well.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-16 as presently pending are thus allowable over the cited prior art. If further discussion would aid in the prosecution of this application, the examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

Date: 8/15/04

Respectfully submitted,

By: Glenn L. Webb

Glenn L. Webb, Reg. No. 32,668
Webb Lewis + Meyers LLC
2300 Fifteenth St., Suite 320
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 534-5040